

# United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/688,574	10/17/2003	Nitin Jhingan	END920030060US1 (16845)	2480
23389	7590 04/12/2006		EXAM	INER
SCULLY SCOTT MURPHY & PRESSER, PC 400 GARDEN CITY PLAZA			CHEN, TE Y	
SUITE 300 GARDEN CITY, NY 11530		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		•	2161	

DATE MAILED: 04/12/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MON TE OF THIS COMMUNICAT	·			
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	Examiner Susan Y. Chen ears on the cover sheet with the state of the s	Art Unit 2161 he correspondence address			
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	Susan Y. Chen  ars on the cover sheet with the state of the same o	2161 he correspondence address			
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MON TE OF THIS COMMUNICAT	he correspondence address			
	IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MON TE OF THIS COMMUNICAT	·			
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply					
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATON THE STATE OF THE ST	I apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS ause the application to become ABAND	be timely filed  from the mailing date of this communication.  ONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status					
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on					
2a) This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) ⊠ This a	This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b)⊠ This action is non-final.				
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposition of Claims					
4) Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawr 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1-18 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or expressions.					
Application Papers					
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  10) The drawing(s) filed on 17 October 2003 is/are:  Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing sheet(s) including the correction of the oath or declaration is objected to by the Example 11) The oath or declaration is objected.	a)⊠ accepted or b)⊡ object rawing(s) be held in abeyance. n is required if the drawing(s) is	See 37 CFR 1.85(a). s objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
<ul> <li>12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).</li> <li>a) All b) Some * c) None of:</li> <li>1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.</li> <li>2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No.</li> <li>3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).</li> <li>* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.</li> </ul>					
Attachment(s)  1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 10/17/2003.	4) Interview Sumn Paper No(s)/Ma 5) Notice of Inform 6) Other:				

-1

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

Claims 1-18 are presented for examination.

## Specification

The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:

Section 0024, the word "pofield" is mistyped.

Appropriate correction is required.

## Claim Objections

Claims 5, 11 and 17 are objected to because of the following informalities:

As to claims 5, 11, and 17, these claims depend on claim 1 but recite a subject matter "the results" that has antecedent basis only at claims 2, 8 and 14, hence, the dependency of claims 5, 11, and 17 should be change to claims 2, 8 and 14 respectively. Appropriate correction is required.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 7-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101, because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Art Unit: 2161

Claims 7-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101, because these claims are directed to a non-statutory subject matter, specifically, the claimed subject matter "framework" does not fall into any one of the four statutory categories of the instant invention, it seems like a software *per se*.

Examiner requests Applicant to include in Applicant's claimed limitations (in all the claims) the following:

Claim limitation describing -

- 1. What is the practical application?
- 2. What is the final results which Applicant considers concrete, useful and tangible?

Because the "practical application, result, concrete, useful and tangible" limitations are not claimed in Applicant's claims, Examiner asserts that the above listed claims are nonstatutory.

To expedite a complete examination of the instant application the claims rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 (nonstatutory) above are further rejected as set forth below in anticipation of applicant amending these claims to place them within the four statutory categories of invention.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

As to claim 1, Applicant claims a operation "mapping data from a data source to a data destination" in the preamble, however, this important step is missing in the claim body, thus, it renders the claim indefinite.

As to claims 2-6, these claims have the same defects as their base claim 1, hence are rejected for the same reason.

Because the ambiguous nature of instant invention, the following art rejection is as the best that the examiner is able to ascertain.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Art Unit: 2161

Claims 1-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Michaelides (U.S. Publication No. 2004/0181753).

### Claim 1:

Michaelides discloses a method for mapping data from source to a data destination [e.g., Abstract, lines 6-9], comprising the steps:

Providing a plurality of components for performing defined functions to map the data from the source to the destination [e.g., Fig. 6, section 0058], the plurality of components performing the steps of

- i) reading data from the source [e.g., When a source feed is activated, data is read from the source at section: 0062];
- ii) processing the read data according to a set of rules [e.g., section: 0065]; and
- iii) loading the processed data into the destination [e.g., When a target feed is activated, data is load from the source feed and written to the target at section: 0062].

### Claim 2:

Except the features recited in claim 1, Michaelides further discloses the steps of

iv) verifying the integrity of the read data [e.g., the use of Verify Button at section: 0095; the use of Verified feed at section: 0191; the use of LdapUtilities at section: 0198]; and

Art Unit: 2161

2 /

v) logging results into a file [e.g., the use of GALogger at section: 0199].

## Claim 3:

Except the features recited in claim 2, Michaelides further discloses a respective one of the components performs each of the steps (i) – (v) [e.g., the unit 50, Fig. 6 and associated texts].

### Claim 4:

Except the features recited in claim 1, Michaelides further discloses that the data source is a flat file [e.g., the units: FileFeedDataSourceImpl, FixedFileFeedDataSourceReaderImpl, etc at section: 0202] and the destination is a database [e.g., section: 0203].

### Claim 5:

Except the features recited in claim 1, Michaelides further discloses that the plurality of components perform the further step of sending the results, by email to a configured list of email addresses [e.g., Fig. 14 and associated texts; section: 0193].

### Claim 6:

Except the features recited in claim 1, Michaelides further discloses that the step of formatting the read data for placement in the data destination [e.g., the use of Formatting engine 102, Fig. 6 and associated texts].

Art Unit: 2161

As to claims 7-12 and 13-18, these claims recite the same features as claims 1-6 in form of a framework and program storage medium, hence, are rejected for the same reason.

#### Conclusion

To expedite the process of re-examination, the examiner requests that all future correspondences in regard to overcoming prior art rejections or other issues (e.g. 35 U.S.C. 112) set forth by the Examiner prior to the office action, that applicant should provide and link to the most specific page and line numbers of the disclosure where the best support is found (see 35 U.S.C. 132).

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure:

Mullins (U.S. Patent No. 6,999,956) which discloses a dynamic objectdriven database manipulation and mapping system.

Young et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2002/0111922) which discloses an electronic markets business interchange system and method to integrate multiple front-end and back-end systems, applications and user's operations.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Susan Y. Chen whose telephone number is

Art Unit: 2161

571-272-4016. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday from

7:00-4:30.

assigned is 571-273-8300.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Safet Metjahic can be reached on 571-272-4023. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-

Susan Y Chen Examiner Art Unit 2161 Page 8

March 31, 2006

free).

UYEN LE
PRIMARY EXAMINER